# JOINT MEETING of CITY OF REDMOND TRAILS COMMISSION and PEDESTRIAN-BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES — February 11, 2004
Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center

**TRAILS COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**: Chairperson Gary Smith, Maureen McCoy, Julie Barnfather, Kris Colt, Sue Chenault, Glenn Eades; Youth Advocate Emily Thompson

PEDESTRIAN-BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Arnie Tomac, Glenn Eades, John Hammersmith, Mike Eddy (arrived at 8:40 p.m.)

**ABSENT**: Ken Bechmann (RTC)

<u>CITY STAFF</u>: Tim Cox, Manager of Parks Planning; Linda Gorremans, Park Planner; Pam Maybee, Recording Secretary

AUDIENCE: Tom Eksten, Carlos Hernandez, Seth Kelsey

Note: Bold/italic text denotes Staff and Commissioner follow-up resulting from this meeting.

#### **AGENDA**

# I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gary Smith called to order the joint meeting of the Redmond Trails Commission (RTC) and the Pedestrian-Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC) at 6:45 p.m. at the Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center (ORSCC).

Chair Smith welcomed members of the Pedestrian-Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC).

# II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of January 28, 2004 minutes were postponed to March meeting.

# III. <u>ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE</u>

## A. Transportation Master Plan (TMP)

Carlos Hernandez, Charlier Associates, Inc., was introduced as the consultant hired to work on the TMP. Hernandez invited all to the kick-off event February 12, 2004, City Council chambers, 5:30 p.m., which would include the following:

- A speaker who is involved with the pedestrian/bicycle interests around the country
- Transportation features around Redmond
- Public voting
- Sign-up for committee participation (bike/ped related)

Hernandez stated the TMP can help put together a bike/ped system, and also with prioritizing/strategizing what happens next. The consultant is interested in working/partnering with the PBAC, meeting in one or two work sessions, and giving input to the consultant on the following:

- Identifying missing links
- Identifying trails (sidewalks vs. bike routes)
- Holding work sessions together
- Obtaining input from the public at different City events (Redmond Town Center, Derby Days, etc.)

Hernandez invited members to contact him tomorrow and/or Friday (February 12 and 13) if they were interested in further discussion. He proposed holding future joint meetings with the two groups again (he will be returning in March).

The kick-off TMP event will be broadcast on RCTV. Those interested in committee involvement who are not able to attend the meeting may contact Kim Van Ekstrom, event coordinator.

Smith suggested the June 5 Trails Day event could provide a TMP public input opportunity; Hernandez agreed.

# IV. <u>DISCUSSION</u>

# A. Trails Functionality - Trails Uses, Linkages

Arnie Tomac, PBAC Chair, noted his committee uses trails for commuting, and asked how RTC views the trails as a commuting route. Smith responded that RTC is more interested in recreational trails, but the overlap is still great. Tomac proposed using trails as both a commuting and recreational means. His concepts include the need to link commuter bike lanes on streets via a trail. Barnfather observed that both groups look at building trail links from different angles, but their goal is the same.

<u>Tom Eksten, King County Parks</u>, provided an update on the Farrel-McWhirter to Watershed missing link:

- Negotiations with PSE began 14 years ago.
- The County just concluded the last two points with PSE: (1) relocation of lines with re-alignment, and (2) liability and indemnification.
- Both parties have agreed on the link.
- PSE wanted one comprehensive agreement prior to doing anything individually on other trail agreements.
- This year the County anticipates the agreement will be signed and the easement acquired.
- There is a written document that both groups' attorneys are reviewing now.
- The County budget would determine when the trail would be built; however, the budget base has been "shrinking."

Chenault asked if private volunteers would be accepted in helping facilitate the trail construction. Eksten replied, yes, that it had been done in parks in the past. He emphasized that King County parks has retained the trail system throughout the diminishing budget, but the process would be slow due to the number of projects throughout the County. If government re-authorization comes forward, it would provide some funds for projects. Eades commended Eksten's (King County's) efforts to keep the trail system viable.

Eksten stated the County as a regional provider can provide consistency, consistent expectations on guidelines, and regulations on management. Eksten explained the County is purchasing a PSE easement in perpetuity with movement within the right-of-way. Relocation is required for the trail. King County is responsible to build the trail itself. PSE would have the ability to use the trail for their maintenance needs as well.

**Eksten will e-mail a copy of the King County trail map to Cox for distribution to Trails Commissioners.** Eades asked that no title be put on any trail in "recreational trail documents" as it imposes limitations. He noted there is no trail that is only used for one purpose.

# B. BNSF Right-of-Way - Acquisition Status, Purpose, and Role Identification

Both groups voiced support for the BNSF right-of-way acquisition.

Colt reminded the TMP consultant to ensure no parking lot would be constructed in the middle of the right-of-way where a trail would be desired.

<u>Seth Kelsey, Redmond Park Board,</u> announced there may be a Park Bond discussion meeting on Friday night, 2/13/04, from 7:00-9:00 p.m. (location TBD), and is open to the public. There is also a transportation meeting on Thursday night. Cox will confirm the Bond meeting and identify the location, and e-mail all with the information.

# C. Proposed New Trails – SR520 Trail, Rose Hill Trail, Old Redmond Road Connector

Tomac reported that the Rose Hill neighborhood plan does talk of including neighborhood trails. PBAC desires to connect 140<sup>th</sup> to Sammamish River Trail (SRT) with an east-west trail. The PBAC thought this would be a good project to work on with RTC. PBAC has a budget of \$80,000 (from City Council) allocated to work on safety improvements, feasibility studies, etc. Tomac suggested that instead of Public Works, have the Planning Department hire a consultant to develop the study. This would involve RTC in determining trail surfaces, etc.

Smith asked RTC to consider involvement in the study if PBAC provided the money. Barnfather reported on her trail experience after hiking the Rose Hill area:

- It is a beautiful, untouched, sensitive area worthy of preservation
- Recommends no paving
- Useful to hikers (possibly equestrian or mountain bikes) (consider other users who would be appropriate)
- Useful for people to walk back and forth to work
- Barnfather favored co-sponsoring a study

Tomac suggested doing a soft surface, but also asked to consider the possibility of connecting with a paved trail from 140<sup>th</sup> to Sammamish River Trail. Commuters/hikers could use the streets then travel on a paved trail connected from 140<sup>th</sup> —now a major bicycle route—to PSE. He supported doing one study and accomplishing goals for both groups. PBAC might be narrower in their focus, but if the goal is combined with RTC's interest, they could get two things done in the one study.

Hernandez urged members to get the items mapped that are not mapped. Since now there are too many terms being used for trails, he suggested clarifying what is a commuting trail and what is a recreational trail. He proposed the first workshop could have photo examples of trails for defining them.

Eades asked for strength from RTC to influence Public Works (or appropriate department) in the project. Tomac believed Planning would be ideal to house the study since it goes beyond hard surface. Cox noted there could be a number of departments interested in working on the study. Tomac asked that staff get together to determine the best department to house it. Cox will help coordinate the appropriate people from departments and groups.

Tomac noted that if a plan is in place, then PBAC could get grants, which they have been successful at getting in the past. Since there are a lot of opportunities, it is imperative they act now. Barnfather added there are many opportunities and trails to preserve now. Tomac voiced interest to work closely with RTC on this endeavor.

Eades, along with Hernandez, advised again for members to step back and look at the plan as to what makes sense now: Have a priority, a strategy, for the best investment.

Barnfather, Tomac, and Smith will meet and discuss. Tomac will initiate with e-mails and contact Dave Alm as well.

#### D. Sammamish River Trail Enhancements

#### 1. 12-foot Widening

Colt referenced page 270 of the Redmond Community Development guide, noting wetland buffers limit trails to 10 feet. She asked how trails could be widened beyond 10 feet.

Seth Kelsey, Park Board Commissioner and Shoreline Advisory Committee member, encouraged Commissioners that now is the time to get in any changes as soon as possible. Cox noted the Planning Commission had already sent the draft language regarding Sammamish River Trail (SRT) to City Council. The language included mitigation for the additional width. Individual projects would have to dictate the trail width. Colt reiterated the Development Guide limits the width.

#### Tom Eksten offered this information:

- The 25-year-old SRT is due for an overlay of the trail.
- 1977 ASHTO standards recommended an 8-foot trail; King County opted for a 10-foot.
- Trail usage and types have increased.
- The County has done trail counts and surveys every 5 years since 1980; significant user conflicts have developed (e.g., crowded with too many users by 1985)
- The County is widening SRT to 12 feet to comply with 1999 ASHTO guidelines. The volume of users demanded the extra width.
- County is acquiring the west bank from Redmond to Bothell (negotiating last piece in Woodinville), and will begin to develop that to provide user separation options (equestrian/pedestrian on west/soft surface, with greater volumes of users on paved).
- Not as much mitigation on the west bank; a crushed rock surface is planned for soft surface equestrian and pedestrian use.
- Next phase will widen the trail from 145<sup>th</sup> to Redmond City limits by summer (budget and bids now being considered).
- County has been widening two feet landward (not riverward); all jurisdictions have required mitigation (habitat improvement along the bank).
- If construction guidelines are passed, then they will be implemented. If not, then at most will do a 10-foot overlay.
- Shoreline Management Plan Development would make the decision.

Cox explained the language states the trail can be widened if associated with specific projects not close to the river, and mitigation applies. Barnfather asked not to limit the widening only to SRT; rather, expand it to all trails—for example, in consideration of the Bear-Evans Creek Trail.

Cox noted there is discussion of modifying the Sensitive Areas Ordinance specific to SRT.

Tomac suggested making known what the two groups want and that it would be influential in appearing before City Council. McCoy suggested highlighting to Council the recognition of change of use, and therefore, recommending the change of trail width.

Eades noted the sensitive areas are colliding with 12-foot wide trails everywhere, and he would disagree with a total blanket of 12-foot wide trails.

Suggestions for the Redmond Community Development Guide number (3) (page 271):

- Barnfather suggested modifying to a minimum trail corridor to meet needs, i.e., the smallest trail as possible to accommodate use.
- Colt proposed taking out (3) (C) (iii) to avoid the 10-foot limit.
- Eksten noted there is a difference between allowing a 12-foot and requiring mitigation, i.e., just because they allow 12 feet doesn't mean it has to be mitigated.
- Barnfather stated the mitigation language is already included.
- Tomac clarified that in the buffer area, mitigation must occur to build a trail.
- Colt did not want a fixed number listed for width; rather, language such as, "For the amount of footage mitigated, provide width for safety and usage."
- McCoy recommended that the number be changed, that members support the wetland mitigation, but recognize the changing usage of trails.

Kelsey encouraged Commissioners to contact Kathy Beam, Planning Department, as she could give some clarification/direction. Tomac and Smith will contact Beam to get direction on drafting a joint letter that would be sent to Council.

Colt expressed concern that the Development guide was restrictive regarding the corridor. Smith suggested staying away from numbers, as well as not substituting numbers. He emphasized meeting the needs of safety with mitigation away from the buffer area.

Colt stated the Shoreline Management Plan and RC Development Guide are both driving this regulation. Tomac noted the TMP could change things as well as by making the shoreline request at the same time. Hernandez recommended members work with staff.

Motion for approval to direct the RTC and PBAC chairpersons to work with Kathy Beam on re-writing language in the Redmond Community Development Guide 20D.140.10-100 (3) (c) 1-4 to include eliminating the 10-foot restriction, keeping the mitigation language, correcting the Shoreline Plan to accommodate current trail needs, and eliminate wording conflicts by: Commissioners Colt and Eades

Second by: Commissioner Barnfather

Motion carried: 6-0 unanimous

# 2. Lighting and Center Lines

Members asked regarding lighting the trail from Redmond Town Center to City Hall. Eksten replied that King County does not light trails due to liability and presumption of safety. Regarding optional centerlines, the County hesitates giving trails the look of streets, but incorporates the lines in areas for safety to keep people in the travel lanes.

Hernandez offered that the TMP could develop standards in districts where lighting would be appropriate.

# E. Trail Accessibility and Appropriate Users

## 1. Segway

As Segways are a growing issue, Smith stated there would need to be practical talk regarding it. There are two extreme positions to take: (1) no light electric vehicles on trails, or (2) no restrictions. He proposed Redmond should at least catch up with Kirkland's research and options for restrictions (see handout). He noted people with mobility problems could now get prescriptions for Segways and would have to be allowed access to trails. In any event, the public could be seeing more of them and other light electric vehicles.

Tomac reported that State house bills 3049 and 3067 are addressing this issue—one more restrictive than the other—and therefore it could become a state issue instead of a city issue.

Barnfather asked Commissioners to look at it not as a vehicle issue, but rather, as a trail enjoyment issue—i.e., what is impacting other users—and institute guidelines coming from that direction, for example, codes of noise, pace, etc. Cox referenced page 4 of the 2/13/03 Kirkland memo for opposition by pedestrian advocacy groups regarding the potential for safety issues.

Hernandez reported that in Boulder, CO, sidewalks are pedestrian only. Wider multi-use trails are for human-powered or low-emission vehicles. The city did an overlay. In a segment downtown where they did not want the vehicles, they instituted dismount zones for mobility devises. ADA users do not need to dismount. He noted that the issue of users would come up in the TMP, and advised Commissioners to take cues from the state level.

Tomac suggested giving local jurisdictions some legislative opportunities to talk about where they should and shouldn't be used. Awareness is key, where members need to share opinions, agree on general approach, and offer input to the state. Tomac has ongoing contact at the state legislature.

Hernandez noted that equestrians would have the most objections to loud scooters for the noise factor.

# F. National Trails Day – Junes 5, 2004

Smith recommended using the Sammamish River Trail at Luke McRedmond landing as the venue for the June 5, 2004 National Trails Day event, adding there would be enough room for other user groups.

Since there would be TMP draft plans (e.g., missing links, corridor standards, etc.) ready by the June date, Hernandez proposed having a booth as a great opportunity (in place of a workshop) to get public input. His consulting group would provide the facilities, if RTC and PBAC would provide people. He noted there must be events going on to draw the crowd such as demos (e.g., kayak), a sidewalk sale (e.g., bikes), school participation (e.g., bike/tricycle race).

RTC and PBAC members all agreed to direct Hernandez to get information to the City's Community Outreach Department, who would

be responsible for marketing and attracting vendors, etc. *Hernandez will follow up with the Outreach Department.* 

# V. REPORTS

- Colt reported the *King County Journal*, 1/30/04 edition, noted their web site offered a new map for scenic walks. The Department of Public Health developed maps for five cities for exercise areas.
- Smith asked for two representatives to attend the 2/18/04, 7:00-9:00 p.m., joint meeting of Boards and Commissions for the Comp Plan update. Eades, Barnfather, and Chenault volunteered to possibly be able to attend. They were asked to RSVP to Cox or Sarah Stiteler, Planning Dept.
- John Hammersmith asked all members to send their comments to update the Redmond Bicycle Guide map to Sarah Stiteler.
- Tomac expressed appreciation for the opportunity to meet with RTC and is looking forward to joining forces in the projects ahead.

#### VI. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Smith at 8:55 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Pam Maybee

THE NEXT REDMOND TRAILS COMMISSION MEETING:
Wednesday, March 24, 2004
Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center
7:00 p.m.